ECCLESIA LAW

# IS THE CORNISH STANNARY VETO A PREROGATIVE FOR EXEMPTING INDIVIDUALS FROM COURT LIABILITIES?

28TH February 2026

The contemporary landscape of jurisdictional conflict is increasingly defined by the intersection of ancient constitutional anomalies and the administrative enclosures of the modern corporate state. Central to this friction is the Cornish Stannary veto claim, a historical prerogative that has been recontextualized by "sovereign" movements as a mechanism for exempting individuals from the liabilities of the "birth certificate construct." This report provides an exhaustive forensic examination of the historical genesis of the Stannary jurisdiction, the ontological deconstruction of the legal person, the structural reasons for the failure of substantive nationalist arguments in domestic courts, and the deployment of the "Art of Legal Warfare" to secure victories through procedural technicalities rather than ideological confrontation.

## The Genesis of the Stannary Jurisdiction and the 1508 Charter of Pardon

The Stannary jurisdiction of Cornwall and Devon represents one of the oldest and most distinct legal frameworks within the United Kingdom, originating from the medieval necessity to regulate the economically vital tin-mining industry. The term "Stannary" is derived from the Latin *stannum*, meaning tin, reflecting a system that pre-dates written legal codes and established what scholars describe as a "state within a state".[1] Historically, the tinners of Cornwall were granted extraordinary privileges by the Crown, effectively insulating them from the common law and the feudal obligations of manorial lords.[3]

The formalization of these rights began with the 1198 return by the Sheriff of Devon and Cornwall and was solidified by the 1201 Charter of King John, which granted tinners the right to be tried solely before their own Stannary courts, presided over by the Lord Warden of the Stannaries.[4] These privileges were confirmed and expanded by Edward I in 1305 and again by Edward III in 1337 upon the creation of the Duchy of Cornwall.[2] The 1337 Charter established the Duke of Cornwall as a "quasi-sovereign" with royal prerogatives, creating a unique constitutional relationship where the Duke, rather than the Monarch, serves as the "Lord Paramount" within Cornish territory.[7]

The most potent element of this jurisdiction, however, emerged from the political instability of the late 15th century. Following the Cornish Rebellion of 1497, sparked by resistance to Henry VII's war taxes, the King sought to pacify the region while securing revenue.[2] In exchange for a substantial payment of £1,000, Henry

VII issued the 1508 Charter of Pardon.[2] This instrument granted the Convocation of the Tinners (the Stannary Parliament) a legislative power unprecedented in the British Isles: the right to veto any act or statute made at Westminster that would be "prejudicial" to the tinners and their interests.[5]

## Forensic Chronology of Stannary Legal Evolution

| Era / Date | Legal Instrument | Key Provision | Jurisdictional Impact |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pre-1198 | Ancient Custom | Right to "bound" land and trial by peers. | Established tinners as a distinct legal class. [2] |
| 1201 | Charter of King John | Lord Warden as sole magistrate; tax exemptions. | Formalized judicial separation from common law courts. [4] |
| 1305 | Charter of Edward I | Right to trial before the Stannary steward. | Established the four stannaries as geographic and legal districts. [2] |
| 1337 | Duchy Charter | Creation of the Duchy of Cornwall. | Linked Stannary rights to the Duke's quasi-sovereign status. [2] |
| 1508 | Charter of Pardon | "Assent and Consent" of 24 Stannators required for laws. | Granted a formal veto power over Westminster legislation. [2] |
| 1568 | Elizabethan Confirmation | Re-constituted the 1508 Charter. | Affirmed the continuity of the veto through subsequent reigns. [5] |
| 1753 | Last Session | Final meeting of the Stannary Parliament in Truro. | Initiation of the period of legislative latency. [2] |
| 1896 | Abolition Act | Abolition of the Vice-Warden's Court. | Transferred judicial powers to the County Courts. [15] |

The mechanism of the veto stipulated that "no statutes, acts, &c., hereafter issuing... be made, unless with the assent and consent" of twenty-four Stannators, six representing each of the four coinage towns: Lostwithiel, Truro, Helston, and Launceston.[1] Proponents of the veto argue that because the British legal system does not recognize the principle of desuetude (where laws lapse through lack of use), the 1508 Charter remains a valid constitutional block on any legislation not specifically approved by the Stannary Parliament, which has not met to provide such consent since 1753.[11]

# The Ontological Bedrock: The Birth Certificate Construct and the Agency Trap

The intersection of the Stannary veto with modern "sovereign" movements rests upon the deconstruction of the "birth certificate construct." This framework posits that the administrative state operates through a system of "ontological bifurcation," where a sentient biological human being is collapsed into a corporate legal fiction upon birth registration.[18] This duality of existence is the "ontological bedrock" upon which the entire global commercial system is built.[18]

The legal system does not interact with biological matter; it interacts solely with "persons," which the Interpretation Act 1978 defines as "a body of persons corporate or unincorporate".[18] When a birth is registered, the state creates an artificial entity—a decedent estate or trust—that serves as the "Player Piece" on the "Monopoly board" of the legal system.[18]

1. **The Living You:** The sentient, biological human being who is the source of all "credit energy." [18]
2. **The Artificial You:** The legal fiction or "registered estate" created via the birth certificate. [18]

The "Agency Trap" is the mechanism used to bind the living human to the liabilities of this artificial construct.[18] Through the Law of Agency, the state presumes the human is the agent and "unlimited surety" for the fiction.[18] When a man or woman identifies as the "person" named on a birth certificate, they are unwittingly accepting the role of surety for a bankrupt corporate entity owned by the state.[18]

## The Salomon Principle Inversion

A critical forensic insight provided by researchers like the Republic of Old Souls (ROS) is the inversion of the Salomon Principle. In *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd*, the court established that a company has a separate legal personality to protect its directors from personal liability.[18] However, in the "Monopoly" of the administrative state, this veil is inverted. The state uses the separation to create a liability-bearing entity (the Artificial You) and then bypasses the corporate veil through "presumed agency" to access the human's labour and energy to satisfy the debt.[18]

| Concept | Standard Legal Application | Administrative Inversion (The Trap) |
|---|---|---|
| Salomon Principle | Protects the human from corporate debt. | Bypasses the human to treat them as surety for the fiction's debt. [18] |
| Law of Agency | Agent acts on behalf of a principal with consent. | Agency is presumed without disclosure or valid contract. [18] |
| Personhood | A tool for corporate interaction. | A tool for state enclosure and asset seizure. [18] |
| Citizenship | A bundle of rights and duties. | A registered estate subject to probate and maritime lien. [18] |

# Why People Believe the Stannary Veto Exempts the Construct

The belief that the Cornish Stannary veto can exempt an individual from the birth certificate construct is based on a "higher-order jurisdiction" argument. Proponents contend that as "heirs and successors" of the original tinners mentioned in the 1508 Charter, they are subject only to Stannary law and not to the "prejudicial" legislation of Westminster.[5]

The argument is that the statutory requirement for birth registration—and the subsequent creation of the legal fiction—is an act of "administrative enclosure" passed by Westminster without the "assent and consent" of the 24 Stannators.[5] Therefore, for a "privileged tinner" or an indigenous Cornish individual, the laws governing birth certificates, Social Security, and modern taxation are jurisdictional nullities.[13]

This belief is reinforced by the specific phrasing of the 1508 Charter, which granted the power of veto not only to the 1,500 named individuals but to their "heirs and successors" in perpetuity.[5] Given that the tin industry once represented over half of the Cornish population, activists argue that this term effectively includes all modern Cornish descendants.[5] By asserting "Stannary rights," they believe they are rescinding the state's presumed agency and re-establishing their standing as biological humans protected by an ancient, un-repealed treaty with the Crown.[5]

ECCLESIA LAW

# Why the Stannary Veto Fails in Court: The Deconstruction

Despite the historical and constitutional weight of the 1508 Charter, modern courts consistently reject the Stannary veto as a defense against general legislation. There are three primary forensic reasons for this failure: the statutory consolidation of 1896, the judicial definition of "prejudicial" acts, and the "category error" committed by proponents of the argument.

## 1. The Stannaries Court (Abolition) Act 1896

The most significant legal hurdle is the Stannaries Court (Abolition) Act 1896, which abolished the Court of the Vice-Warden and transferred its jurisdiction to the County Courts.[15] While nationalists argue that the Act only abolished the *court* and not the *parliamentary* veto, the judiciary interprets the 1896 Act as a final consolidation of Stannary law into the national framework.[17] The government's position, articulated as recently as 2007, is that there are no valid Stannary organizations in existence and that Cornwall is an integral part of the Union, subject to all general Acts of Parliament.[13]

## 2. The Scope of the Veto: The "Tinner" Limitation

The 1508 Charter specifically applied to "tinners, workers of black and white tin" and those "meddling" with minerals.[5] Modern courts have ruled that this privilege is commercial in nature, not personal or territorial.[9] In the case of Mr. Trull, the court rejected the attempt to avoid the community charge by purchasing shares in a "phantom" tin-mining company, ruling that such a device did not grant immunity from general taxation.[14] The judiciary views the veto as limited to laws *specifically* targeting the mining industry, rather than a blanket exemption for all Cornish people from laws of general application.[4]

## 3. The Lack of Current Proclamation

Legal analysis from Cornwall Council underscores that for a veto to be effective, there must be a proclamation from a *seated* Stannary Parliament.[17] Because the Parliament has not met since 1753, it has not exercised its veto over any legislation passed since that time, including the acts governing modern administrative constructs.[17] Courts do not recognize a "latent" or "implied" veto claimed by individuals; the default position remains that Westminster law applies until a validly constituted Stannary body says otherwise.[17]

ECCLESIA LAW

## Comparison of Failed Status Arguments vs. Forensic Reality

| Argument | Proponent Belief | Forensic Reality / Court View |
|---|---|---|
| 1508 Veto | Exempts the individual from all UK taxes. | Limited to industry-specific prejudicial acts. [14] |
| Heirs and Successors | Includes all Cornish people by descent. | Narrowly interpreted to mean active mining interests. [14] |
| Non-repeal of Charter | The Charter is superior to Westminster acts. | Consistently overborne by subsequent statutory consolidation. [17] |
| "Man vs Person" | Biological status overrides legal fiction. | Courts operate in a forum of form (agency), not biology. [18] |
| Diplomatic Immunity | Status as a "foreign" Cornish subject. | Engaging in commerce as an agent of the fiction waives immunity. [18] |

# The Art of Legal Warfare: Winning Through "Technical Knockouts"

The shift from substantive Stannary arguments to the "Art of Legal Warfare" represents a strategic evolution in jurisdictional conflict. This doctrine, championed by groups like Ecclesia Law and the Republic of Old Souls, acknowledges that arguing the "truth" of the Stannary veto or the birth certificate construct is often a losing battle in a system rigged to protect its own administrative enclosures.[18] Instead, the strategy focuses on securing a "Technical Knockout" (TKO) by prioritizing procedural violations and the "Sniper Shots" of incidental issues.[18]

The TKO strategy relies on the fact that the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and regulatory bodies are risk-averse. They do not need to be convinced that the defendant is a "living man" or a "privileged tinner";

they only need to be shown that the prosecutor has failed in their duties as a "Minister of Justice," rendering the case a procedural liability.[18]

## 1. Spoliation of Evidence: The "Minister of Justice" Failure

A primary tactic in the Art of Legal Warfare is identifying "Spoliation of Evidence".[18] In private prosecutions, the prosecutor is held to an absolute Duty of Candour and must act as a "Minister of Justice".[18] A notable case study involves Simon Goldberg, who allegedly bulk-deleted two years of his own Facebook history on the same day he announced his intention to prosecute.[18]

Forensically, this destruction of evidence destroys the "Presumption of Regularity" granted to prosecutors.[18] By destroying the records of his own interactions, Goldberg destroyed the primary evidence required to determine if the defendant's conduct was "harassment" or a "response to provocation".[18] The "Kill Shot" for the defence is to argue that such tampering renders a fair trial impossible, forcing the CPS to discontinue the case under the Evidentiary Stage of the Full Code Test.[18]

## 2. Counsel Conflict and POCA Violations: The "Gatekeeper" Failure

The strategy further targets the professional integrity of the prosecutor's legal representation. In the Goldberg matter, the defence highlighted that the prosecution's barrister, Gary Summers, was being funded by "Empower The People," an entity whose infrastructure had been seized for Money Laundering and Ponzi scheme violations.[18]

Under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 (POCA), if a client facilitate fraud—such as the 1099-OID fraud Goldberg allegedly admitted to—the funds paying the barrister are legally "Criminal Property".[18] By serving a "Notice of Liability" to the barrister's chambers, the defence forces a conflict of interest. A barrister cannot ethically represent a client while being a witness to that client's "unclean hands" or receiving fees from the proceeds of crime.[18] Without a barrister to "vouch" for the prosecution, the standing of the case collapses.[18]

## 3. The Pincer Movement: Substantive and Technical Attacks

The Art of Legal Warfare utilizes a "Pincer Movement" to secure a strike-out by attacking from two simultaneous angles:

- **Side A: Substantive Argument (Unclean Hands):** This involves using the prosecutor's own admissions of criminal activity (e.g., wire fraud or unauthorized financial brokering) to argue that a criminal enterprise cannot use the courts to enforce silence.[18]
- **Side B: Technical Argument (Procedural Abuse):** This highlights the spoliation of evidence and the submission of fabricated witness statements (e.g., statements from "Mr. Paul" citing non-existent foundations like the "Bauer Rothschild Foundation") to prove that the prosecutor is actively deceiving the court.[18]

ECCLESIA LAW

# Capacity Correction: The Envoy Protocol and the 98-Series Trust

For those seeking to exit the "Monopoly board" of the administrative state, the solution is not to fight the "Artificial You" but to master its administration through "capacity correction".[18] The Envoy Protocol provides the operational framework for this transition from "Surety" to "General Executor".[18]

## Severing Agency via Clausula Rebus Sic Stantibus (CRSS)

The protocol utilizes the international law principle of *Clausula Rebus Sic Stantibus* ("things thus standing") to rescind the presumed agency relationship formed at birth.[18] The argument is that the "fundamental circumstances" have changed: the individual is no longer an infant requiring state wardship but is a competent adult.[18] By severing the tacit agreement of agency, the individual moves into the "Office of General Executor" for the registered estate.[18]

## Fiduciary Immunity and the General Executor

As the General Executor, the individual directs the administration of the legal person's accounts from a position of "fiduciary immunity".[18] This status reframes the individual's standing away from domestic administrative presumptions and toward a "higher-order jurisdiction" of "ecclesiastical or international exteriority".[18] Crucially, an executor is not personally liable for the debts of the estate provided they do not "intermeddle" with the assets as a private citizen.[18]

| Strategic Component | Mechanism | Operational Result |
|---|---|---|
| **CRSS Invocation** | International Law Principle. | Rescinds presumed agency ab initio. [18] |
| **Office of General Executor** | Administrative Capacity. | Provides fiduciary immunity from domestic debt. [18] |
| **98-Series Trust** | Fiduciary Proxy. | Establishes "Holder in Due Course" (HDC) status. [18] |
| **IRS 1212 / OID** | Commercial Recoupment. | Corrects "Nominee Misreporting" and recovers credit. [18] |

### Recoupment through the 98-Series Trust

To operationalize this separation, the individual establishes a "98-Series International Grantor Trust" to act as a fiduciary proxy.[18] This trust interacts with the financial system to recoup "abandoned credit" generated by the individual's interaction with banks and tax offices, which act as "nominees" holding debt instruments.[18]

By filing corrective forms (such as the 1099-OID) supported by IRS Publication 1212, the trust identifies itself as the "true beneficial owner" of the credit energy.[18] This process utilizes the "Three-Check Algorithm," where the IRS matches the Trust's claim against the nominee's Master Record.[18] Once verified, the U.S. Treasury authorizes a disbursement, effectively allowing the individual to satisfy the estate's liabilities using the system's own credit, rather than their private labor.[18]

## Conclusion: The Transition from Pawn to Banker

The analysis of the Cornish Stannary veto and its relationship to the birth certificate construct reveals a complex interplay between ancient constitutional rights and modern administrative strategy. While the Stannary veto provides a powerful narrative of historical autonomy, its effectiveness as a direct legal shield is systematically neutralized by the modern judiciary through statutory consolidation and narrow interpretations of "tinner" status.[14]

The path to victory in court lies not in the substantive rejection of the legal persona, but in the "Art of Legal Warfare"—securing technical knockouts through the identification of procedural violations such as spoliation of evidence and counsel conflict.[18] By forcing the CPS to discontinue cases based on the prosecutor's failure as a "Minister of Justice," litigants avoid the "mimetic traps" of pseudo-law while achieving their objective.[18]

Furthermore, the "Advanced Player Strategy" moves the individual toward a "Peaceful Exit" from the technocratic enclosure by mastering the administration of the Artificial You.[18] Through the Envoy Protocol, capacity correction via CRSS, and the establishment of 98-Series Trusts, the living man and woman transition from the role of "unlimited surety" to that of "General Executor".[18] This jurisdictional shift allows for the recoupment of abandoned credit and the re-establishment of fiduciary immunity, effectively playing the game of Monopoly to win.[18] The final realization of this analysis is that the system's greatest strength—its complex administrative rules—is also its "Achilles' Heel" for those with the correct capacity and a resolute strategic mindset.[18]

ECCLESIA LAW

**Works cited**


1. Private Issues – The Cornish Stannary Parliament - P J Symes, accessed on February 28, 2026, http://www.pjsymes.com.au/articles/Private02.htm
2. Stannary law - Wikipedia, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stannary_law
3. THE STANNARIES - The Devonshire Association, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://devonassoc.org.uk/wd/wd272.pdf
4. Cornish Stannary Parliament - Wikipedia, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cornish_Stannary_Parliament
5. stannery - RootsWeb, accessed on February 28, 2026, http://freepages.rootsweb.com/~soskernow/history/stannery.htm
6. Time to Abolish the Duchy of Cornwall? - Semantic Scholar, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/9fcb/bbc989b54db1d3ee9c87206cb5c330ee8fb4.pdf
7. Constitutional Implications of the Cabinet Manual - Parliament UK, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmselect/cmpolcon/writev/734/cicm06.htm
8. House of Commons - Political and Constitutional Reform Committee - Written Evidence, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmselect/cmpolcon/734/734vw08.htm
9. The Construction of Cornish Identity, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://univerlag.uni-goettingen.de/bitstream/3/isbn-978-3-86395-244-0.6/1/06_GSEP10_Transfers_Schlink_231-266.pdf
10. Cornish devolution - Wikipedia, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cornish_devolution
11. Self-rule for Cornwall | Peter Tatchell - The Guardian, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2008/nov/10/cornwall
12. Grant of pardon to the tinners of Cornwall, 1508 - Wikisource, the free online library, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Grant_of_pardon_to_the_tinners_of_Cornwall,_1508
13. Revived Cornish Stannary Parliament - Wikipedia, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revived_Cornish_Stannary_Parliament
14. The Curious Case of Mr Trull - The Worshipful Company of Tax Advisers | City of London, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://www.taxadvisers.org.uk/mr_trull/
15. Stannaries Court (Abolition) Act 1896 - Legislation.gov.uk, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/59-60/45/data.html

16. Stannaries Court (Abolition) Act 1896 - Legislation.gov.uk, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/59-60/45
17. ROCHE PARISH COUNCIL, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://www.rocheparishcouncil.gov.uk/6%201%2025%20Full%20Minutes.pdf
18. THE ART OF LEGAL WARFARE.pdf
19. Cornwall, minorities and the law | Law & Religion UK, accessed on February 28, 2026, https://lawandreligionuk.com/2014/04/29/cornwall-minorities-and-the-law/